

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sasaki (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0105016A1; hereinafter “Sasaki”). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Yokoyama (U.S. Patent No. 5,381,163; hereinafter “Yokoyama”). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Shiraiwa (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0162695A1; hereinafter “Shiraiwa”). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Ohta (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0051230 A1; hereinafter “Ohta”) and further in view of Redd et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0190400 A1; hereinafter “Redd”). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Redd. Claims 7-12 are rejected for reasons similar to those presented for claims 1-6. Claims 13-18 are rejected for reasons similar to those presented for claims 1-6. Claims 19, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,661,987; hereinafter “Anderson”). Claims 22, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Sasaki. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Yokoyama and further in view of Prakash et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,788,698; hereinafter “Prakash”). Applicant submits the arguments below in traversal.

Rejection of Claims 1 and 3 under § 102(e) by Sasaki

Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Sasaki because Sasaki does not disclose or suggest and sequentially outputting said processed small blocks of image data to an output device which is separate from an apparatus performing said image process, in combination with other elements of the claim.

As described in the Specification of the present invention on page 4, lines 14 to 22, and page 15, line 26 to page 16, line 4, one of the objects of the present invention is **to prevent forming a large number of temporary files, which would decrease the performance level during output of the processed image to an output device**. In an exemplary embodiment, the present invention achieves this object by the steps or means recited in the claims, especially by the step of “sequentially outputting said processed small blocks of image data to an output device separate from an apparatus performing said image process,” as recited in claim 1.

In the Office Action, page 4, the Examiner states that Figure 2 and paragraph 4 of Sasaki show the step of “sequentially outputting said small blocks of processed image data to an output destination,” as previously recited in claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that neither Figure 2 nor paragraph 4 of Sasaki discloses or suggests the claimed outputting step.

Further, Figure 5 and paragraph 118 of Sasaki teach that the data processed by the elements 41 to 45 (the resulting data) is **stored in frame units** in buffers 29b, 29c and may be outputted to an external I/F 26 or the like. This description clearly shows that the device disclosed in Sasaki does not sequentially output the processed small blocks of image data to an output device which is separate from an apparatus performing said image process, but outputs the processed full image data (frames) to an external device.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable.

Claim 3, which depends from claim 1, is patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1.

Rejection of Claim 2 under § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of Yokoyama

Claim 2, which depends from claim 1, is patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1 and because Yokoyama fails to make up for the deficiencies of Sasaki.

Rejection of Claim 4 under § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of Shiraiwa

Claim 4, which depends from claim 1, is patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1 and because Shiraiwa fails to make up for the deficiencies of Sasaki.

Rejection of Claim 5 under § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of Ohta and further in view of Redd

Claim 5, which depends from claim 1, is patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1 and because Ohta and Redd fail to make up for the deficiencies of Sasaki.

Rejection of Claim 6 under § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of Redd

Claim 6, which depends from claim 1, is patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1 and because Redd fail to make up for the deficiencies of Sasaki.

The remaining claims 7-18 are patentable for at least the reasons similar to those submitted for claim 1.

Rejection of Claims 19, 20 and 21 under § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of Anderson

Claims 19-21 are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1 and because Anderson fails to make up for the deficiencies of Sasaki.

Claims 20-21 are patentable based at least by virtue of their dependencies.

Rejection of Claims 22, 23 and 24 under § 103(a) over Anderson in view of Sasaki

Claim 22 is patentable for reasons similar to those submitted for claim 1, i.e., Sasaki does not disclose or suggest a method wherein the second processing outputs the processed output to an output device which is separate from an apparatus performing said image process.

Claims 23 and 24, which depend from claim 22, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 22.

Rejection of Claims 25 and 26 under § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of Yokoyama and further in view of Prakash

Claims 25 and 26, which depend from claim 2, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1 and because Yokoyama and Prakash fail to make up for the deficiencies of Sasaki.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.114  
U.S. APPLN. NO.: 10/078,499

ATTY DOCKET NO.: Q66587

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
Susan P. Pan  
Registration No. 41,239

Date: August 4, 2006